

1 Probation Officer noted that he believed there were more mitigating than aggravating factors
2 concerning Mr. Farias-Becerra, and made a low-end Recommendation of twelve months
3 custody. The original Sentencing Summary Chart filed on behalf of Mr. Farias-Becerra
4 arrived at the same Resulting Offense Level and Sentencing Guideline Range, and
5 recommended a twelve month and one day sentence.
6

7 Defendant now makes the request for consideration of an additional Two Level
8 Downward Adjustment or Departure in order to arrive at a Resulting Offense Level of 11, and
9 a Sentencing Guideline Range of 8 to 14 months. The Primary basis for this supplemental
10 request for consideration of a lower Resulting Offense Level and Guideline Range is the hope
11 to avoid an unwarranted sentencing disparity between the two defendants in this case.
12 Defense counsel notes that Co-Defendant Tiznado received an eight month sentence. Counsel
13 for Tiznado argued that she was youthful (19 years old), that she had never before been
14 convicted of a crime, and that she was the victim of her own “youthful inability to anticipate
15 the consequences of her decisions”. Her attorney further argued that she had learned her
16 lesson.
17

18
19 The same factors argued on behalf of Defendant Tiznado are applicable to Mr. Farias-
20 Becerra. He also is youthful (age 20), is in Criminal History Category I, and was subject to
21 the same youthful inability to anticipate the consequences of his decisions. There is, however,
22 a big difference between these two defendants that operates entirely in favor of Mr. Farias-
23 Becerra. The Probation Officer reported no prior law enforcement contacts of any nature
24 whatsoever as to Mr. Farias-Becerra. This is not true as to the “youthful and naïve” Ms.
25 Tiznado. Her “youthful” record of law enforcement contact included three prior
26 “apprehensions” while attempting to smuggle undocumented aliens into the United States
27
28

1 (11/28/04, 8/25/07, and 10/13/07). Thus it is perfectly clear that Ms. Tiznado had actually
2 been in the business of alien smuggling since she was indeed very youthful. Mr. Farias-
3 Becerra has no such history.

4
5 Again, the primary focus of this Amended Sentencing Memorandum is to address the
6 issue of avoiding a significant sentencing disparity. The fact that Mr. Farias-Becerra was the
7 driver in this particular incident is outweighed in terms of any greater culpability than
8 defendant Tiznado, by virtue of the fact that Mr. Farias-Becerra had no prior record of law
9 enforcement contact, while Ms. Tiznado had three prior alien smuggling apprehensions. If
10 Ms. Tiznado is deserving of a Two Level Downward Adjustment, notwithstanding her history
11 of involvement in alien smuggling (albeit not a conviction), Mr. Farias-Becerra is deserving of
12 consideration of the same sentence. Given the facts of this case and these two defendants, it
13 would indeed be a disparate sentence for Mr. Farias-Becerra to receive anything greater than
14 the eight month sentence imposed on Ms. Tiznado. Mr. Farias-Becerra was the driver in this
15 instance, but that factor is outweighed (as stated) by the alien smuggling apprehension history
16 of Ms. Tiznado. In fact, it is frequently the case that the passenger is more deeply involved in
17 alien smuggling than the driver who has been recruited to fulfill that riskier position. Many
18 times the passenger escapes prosecution, while the driver, having been informed by the
19 recruiter that alien smuggling is not considered to be a serious offense, takes the fall. In view
20 of her past history, it is entirely likely that Ms. Tiznado was providing instructions to Mr.
21 Farias-Becerra.
22
23
24

25 In the interest of fairness and equity, and with an eye to avoiding disparity of
26 sentencing as to similarly situated defendants, it is respectfully submitted that Mr. Farias-
27 Becerra merits a Two Level Downward Adjustment for Minor Role and an eight month
28

1 sentence. The same result can be accomplished by either an Aberrant Behavior Downward
2 Departure (a no criminal history in Mexico official certification letter was filed with the Court
3 on 2/20/08), or by virtue of a Combination of Factors Downward Departure (the Probation
4 Officer notes that there are more mitigating than aggravating factors applicable to Mr. Farias-
5 Becerra). Lastly, since the Guidelines are advisory only, the Court has unlimited discretion to
6 fashion a sentence which avoids unwarranted disparity between the sentences of co-defendant
7 Tiznado and Mr. Farias-Becerra.
8

9 Respectfully Submitted,
10

11
12 s/Donald A. Nunn
13 Donald A. Nunn,
14 Attorney for Defendant Hector Guillermo Farias-
Becerra

15 DATED: March 31, 2008
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Donald A. Nunn declare that:

I am, and was at the time of service of the papers herein referred to, over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action; and I am employed in the County of San Diego, California. My business address is 13426 Community Road. Poway, California.

I caused to be served by electronic mail on March 31, 2008:

AMENDED SENTENCING MEMORANDUM

to the following:

- **Gregory Murphy**
gregory_murphy@fd.org, cori_cardona@fd.org
- **U S Attorney CR**
Efile.dkt.gc2@usdoj.gov

s/Donald A. Nunn

Donald A. Nunn,
Attorney for Defendant Hector Guillermo Farias-
Becerra